

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 4-8 and 10-17 are amended, and claims 19 and 20 are added. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 7 and 14 is found in the specification at, for example, paragraph [0040]. No new matter is added. Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action objects to the drawings. Claims 6 and 11 are amended to obviate the objection. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action objects to claims 2, 4, 7, 12, 14 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for insufficient antecedent basis. The claims are amended as suggested by the Examiner. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action objects to claims 10, 11 and 14 for informalities. The claims are amended to obviate the objection. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 5, 7-10 and 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 1,500,870 to Holdredge. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Holdredge fails to disclose "a connecting part that connects the first anchor bolt and the second anchor bolt, the first anchor bolt and the second anchor bolt being attached to the connecting part," as recited in independent claim 1.

The Office Action alleges that the pins or rods 6 of Holdredge correspond to the claimed first anchor bolt, and that the plate 1 corresponds to the claimed connecting part (see Fig. 1). However, the pins or rods 6 of Holdredge are not attached to the plate 1. Instead, the pins or rods 6 are inserted through openings in the plate 1 and into the ground (see lines 70-86). Further, Holdredge discloses that a grave marker M or the like may be positioned with the pins or rods 6, and that the marker M may be readily removed (see lines 21-27 and 74-80).

Thus, the pins or rods 6 of Holdredge are not attached to the plate 1 or the marker M.

Accordingly, Holdredge fails to disclose each of the features recited in claim 1.

Independent claims 7 and 14 recite similar features as independent claim 1, and are therefore also patentable over Holdredge for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 1. Claims 2, 3, 5, 8-10, 13 and 15 each depend from one of independent claims 1, 7 and 14, and are therefore also patentable over Holdredge for at least the reasons enumerated above, as well as for the additional features that claims 2, 3, 5, 8-10, 13 and 15 recite.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 4 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Holdredge, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,604,899 to Kubler et al. (Kubler). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Holdredge fails to disclose each of the features of independent claims 1 and 7, from which claims 4 and 12 respectively depend. Kubler fails to overcome the deficiencies of Holdredge. Thus, claims 4 and 12 are patentable over Holdredge and Kubler for at least their dependency on independent claims 1 and 7, respectively, as well as for the additional features that claims 4 and 12 recite.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 6 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Holdredge. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Holdredge fails to disclose "a connecting part that connects the first anchor bolt and the second anchor bolt, the first anchor bolt and the second anchor bolt being attached to the connecting part," as recited in independent claims 1 and 7, from which claims 6 and 11 respectively depend. Further, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the foundation structure of Holdredge to achieve the

features of claims 6 and 11. Specifically, Holdredge is directed to a readily detachable mounting for grave markers to facilitate mowing grass. It would not make sense to modify the structure of Holdredge to increase the permanence of the structure. Accordingly, it would not have been obvious to modify Holdredge to achieve the features recited in claims 6 and 11.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 16 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 7,475,518 to Suehiro, in view of Holdredge. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action alleges that it would have been obvious to combine the method of Suehiro with the connecting part of Holdredge to achieve the features of claim 16, because the combination would allegedly allow the first anchor bolt to be positioned on either side of the second anchor bolt and still be within the connector plate. However, the combination is improper.

Neither Suehiro nor Holdredge identifies the problem sought to be solved by the features recited in claim 16. Specifically, the features of claim 16 alleviate the transformation force induced by a bending moment acting on the joining point between the connecting part and the second anchor bolt (see paragraph [0007] of the specification). Instead, Suehiro is concerned with problems arising from reinforcement obstructions such that anchor bolts tend to be deviated from the installation position (see col. 1 lines 36-50 and col. 2 lines 6-10). Holdredge identifies a need for securing markers while facilitating ready portability. It would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, seeking to solve the problem discussed above, to look to Holdredge to modify Suehiro. Further, Holdredge is designed for insertion into grass, not concrete or reinforced concrete. Holdredge also fails to disclose any attendant benefits relating to alleviating a transformation force induced by a bending moment. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would not look to Holdredge to overcome the deficiencies of Suehiro, especially where neither reference discloses the deficiencies or a need

as discussed in the present application. Thus, the combination in the Office Action of Suehiro and Holdredge is improper. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Suehiro, in view of Holdredge, and further in view of Kubler. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 17 and 18 depend from independent claim 16, and are therefore also patentable over the applied references for at least the above enumerated reasons, as well as for the additional features that claims 17 and 18 recite. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Added claims 19 and 20 are patentable over the applied references at least based on their dependency from claims 1 and 7 respectively, as well as for the additional features that claims 19 and 20 recite.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-20 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Ryan M. Crockett
Registration No. 62,945

JAO:RMC/jnm

Attachment:
Request for Continued Examination

Date: March 11, 2010

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry of this filing; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
